

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-24, and 39-41 were previously canceled.

Claim 3 has been amended.

The amendment of Claims 3 is supported by Claims 3 and 4 as originally and previously pending. Additional support for the amendment to Claim 3 can be found in the specification as filed, at least, on pages 8-12 (for example, page 8, second paragraph, page 9, last paragraph, and page 12, second paragraph).

No new matter has been added by the present amendment.

REMARKS

Claims 3, 25-38, and 42-48 are pending in the present application.

The rejection of Claims 3, 25-38, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is obviated by amendment.

Applicants have amended the claims herein to provide clarity with respect to the HTM layer and the dye layer.

Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

The rejections of:

- (a) Claims 3, 27-31, 33, 34, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Goossens et al. (1998) in view of Nakamura (US 6,291,763);
- (b) Claims 3, 30-32, 36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Goossens et al. (1998) in view of Saurer (US 5,482,570) and Tang (US 4,164,431);
- (c) Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Goossens et al. (1998) in view of Nakamura (US 6,291,763) and further in view of Yu et al.;
- (d) Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Goossens et al. (1998) in view of Nakamura (US 6,291,763) and further in view of Yamamoto et al.; and
- (e) Claims 35 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Goossens et al. (1998) in view of Nakamura (US 6,291,763) and further in view of Sakurai et al.;

are obviated by amendment.

The Examiner alleges that it would be obvious for the skilled artisan to replace in the solar cell with the structure “substrate+EM/SOL/dye/liquid electrolyte/EM” as taught in Goossens et al the liquid electrolyte with the solid doped HTM that is disclosed in Nakamura,

wherein Nakamura also discloses to deposit the HTM by vacuum evaporation (see Nakamura, col 28, l. 31-35). Thus, it is the Examiner's position that the skilled artisan would arrive at a solar cell with the structure "substrate+EM/SOL/dye/HTM/EM", wherein SOL and HTM would be deposited by vapor deposition. .

The Examiner further alleges that it would have been obvious for the skilled artisan to replace in the solar cell "substrate+EM/SOL/dye/liquid electrolyte/EM" of Goossens et al the liquid electrolyte with the HTM that is taught in Saurer (Cu Pc as in the present examples). The Examiner further alleges that the skilled artisan would furthermore know from Tang that CuPc layers can be deposited by vapor sublimation (see Tang, col 13, l. 58-61).

Applicants make no statement with respect to the propriety of these allegations and/or these grounds of rejection and in no way acquiesce to the same. Solely to expedite examination of this application, Applicants have amended Claim 3 to require that each of the SOL, the HTM layer, and the dye layer are produced by vapor deposition. At no point do any of Goossens et al, Nakamura, Saurer et al, Yu et al, Tang, Yamamoto et al, and Sakurai et al disclose or suggest that each of the SOL, the HTM layer, and the dye layer are produced by vapor deposition.

Thus, the subject-matter of the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Goossens et al in combination with any other of the cited secondary references. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is requested.

Finally, Applicants remind the Examiner that, should the elected species be found allowable, the Office should expand its search to the non-elected species.

Application Serial No. 10/799,257
Reply to Office Action of November 4, 2008.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)